

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant has amended the claims to indicate that the prismatic cell includes a metal wire extended along the long axis of the anode. This limitation was originally in claim 4, which has now been canceled. Therefore, applicant is only inserting the limitation from a dependent claim into claim 1, and respectfully requests that this amendment be entered.

The claims stand rejected under 25 U.S.C. § 103 over the Kuroda reference and further in view of the Rosansky reference. As previously indicated, the present invention is a prismatic cell that has an anode tab that extends only a portion of the way down the anode and has insulating tape attached to the second side of the anode, the side on which the anode tab is not attached. Neither the insulation tape nor the anode tab extends all the way down to the bottom of the anode. This maintains anode active material below the tab so that it can conduct current, which effectively reduces the impedance of the battery. Applicant now claims a wire, which extends along the length of the anode. This is a current collecting wire, which obviously is not consumed or destroyed during use, but remains intact.

Applicant indicated previously that the Kuroda reference does not include the limitation of insulation tape attached to a second side of said anode opposite said anode tab. The anode tab is, of course, defined as attached to the first side. Applicant still maintains that this is not disclosed in the Kuroda reference. Referring to the applicant's drawings, the insulation tape is shown as 36 in FIGS. 1 and 2. Therefore, the anode tab 30 is on one side of the anode, and the insulating tape 36 is on the

opposite side of the anode. The insulating tape cannot touch the anode tab. As discussed in the background, this structure, in part, causes the problem. The insulators are not porous making the material they cover inactive.

The Examiner pointed out that, in Kuroda, the insulating tape disclosed in FIG. 2 is attached to the cathode. Therefore, as indicated by the Examiner, this cannot meet the limitation of applicant's claim. The Examiner has indicated that the insulating tape shown in FIG. 6 is on both sides of the anode tab. That still does not meet applicant's limitation. The insulating tape must not be on both sides of the anode tab, but must be on the anode on a side opposite the anode tab. Kuroda discloses insulating tape 68, which is on the opposite side. However, this insulating tape is not "opposite said anode tab". It is, rather, set off to the side and serves a totally different purpose. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 fails to include each and every limitation of claim 1 and, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Applicant has further amended claim 1, and indicated that there is a current-conducting wire along the length of the anode. With this structure, one skilled in the art would never rely on the disclosure in the Kuroda reference to arrive at applicant's invention. As previously indicated, the Kuroda reference is designed to provide a break in the continuity of the lithium on the inside wrap near the end of the battery's life. The intention is, therefore, to do the exact opposite of the current-collecting wire, which is to maintain continuity. Because Kuroda is intended to break the continuity, it will not see an improvement in impedance toward the end of the life of the battery. Therefore, it will not appreciate the benefits of applicant's invention.

Further, applicant's defined structure with the current-collecting wire would, in turn defeat the purpose of the Kuroda reference. As previously indicated, these two references are almost diametrically opposed. Certainly, their intended purposes are.

The final question is, would one skilled in the art rely on the Kuroda reference in combination with the other cited prior art to arrive at applicant's invention. Since the Kuroda reference does not teach that the positioning of the anode tab has any effect on impedance, one skilled in the art would not look at this to solve applicant's problem. Further, since applicant's structure with the current-collecting wire would prevent a break in continuity, which is the main purpose behind the Kuroda reference, one skilled in the art would not use the disclosure in the Kuroda reference to arrive at applicant's invention.

Finally, as previously indicated, the Kuroda structure in combination with the cited prior art simply does not disclose all the elements of applicant's invention, specifically, the location of the insulator, which contributes to the problem applicant is addressing. Although location of insulating tape opposite an anode tab in prior art prismatic cells is known, there certainly is no reason why one skilled in the art would

Application Serial No. 10/792,242  
Amendment dated September 10, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed July 10, 2007

rely on the Kuroda reference to combine all these features to arrive at applicant's invention. In light of this, applicant would request allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

By /Gregory J. Lunn/  
Gregory J. Lunn, Reg. No. 29,945

2700 Carew Tower  
441 Vine Street  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
(513) 241-2324 - Telephone  
(513) 241-6234 - Facsimile